

REMARKS

Claims 39-58 are currently pending in the application. Of these claims, claims 39, 48, 53, and 56 are independent.

Rejections

Claims 39-41, 43-44, and 47-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,513,109 B1 to Gschwind et al. ("Gschwind").

Claims 42, 45-46, and 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gschwind.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as follows.

Independent claims 39, 48, 53, and 56 recite execution of a first instruction to write predicate values to a second register file prior to commitment of the first instruction and execution of a second instruction pending with the first instruction and having a data dependency with the first instruction to access the first register file prior to commitment of the first instruction.

Applicant respectfully submits Gschwind did not teach or suggest such feature(s) as claimed.

The Office Action in paragraph 5 on pages 2-3 and in paragraph 24 on pages 7-8 refers to a write by a cmp instruction to an architected predicate register 410 in Figure 7 of Gschwind and an access by an addi instruction of a future predicate register 405 in Figure 7 of Gschwind.

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that an architected predicate register 410 would be written when the cmp instruction is committed. See, e.g., Gschwind in column 15 at lines 13-16. A write by the cmp instruction to an architected predicate register 410 therefore cannot be equated with execution of a first instruction to write predicate values to a second register file prior to commitment of the first instruction as claimed by Applicant.

Noting the remaining rejected claims depend from independent claim 39, 48, 53, or 56, Applicant therefore respectfully submits these rejections of claims 39-58 have been overcome and should accordingly be withdrawn.

Note that there may be additional reasons for the patentability of claims. For example, there may be additional reasons why the dependent claims are patentable.

Request for Evidence to Support Official Notice

Applicant notes the rejections of claims 42, 45-46, and 56-58 rely on use of Official Notice. Applicant respectfully traverses such use of Official Notice and respectfully requests evidence that features of these claims were well-known.

More particularly with respect to claim 42, the Office Action in paragraph 21 on page 6 appears to refer to a list of available individual registers within a register file. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that such a register file would have already been allocated because its registers are being used and reused individually. Indeed, such a register file would not be deallocated while any of its registers are in use. Applicant therefore respectfully submits a list of available individual registers cannot be equated with a list to identify a register file to be allocated.

It is respectfully submitted this patent application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to help expedite the prosecution of this patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 1, 2006

/Matthew C. Fagan, Reg. No. 37,542/
Matthew C. Fagan
Registration No. 37,542
Telephone: (512) 732-3936
Facsimile: (512) 732-3912 (please call first)

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, L.L.P.
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
Telephone: (503) 439-8778
Telephone: (310) 207-3800